

REMARKS

This is in reply to the Office Action dated June 6, 2006. The present application was filed on September 12, 2003 with original claims 1-41. The claims remaining in the application are claims 1-41. Claims 1, 30 and 40 are independent. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-10, 13-17, 22-28, 30, 40 and 41 were rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over US Published Patent Application 20040137978 filed on December 28, 2005, listing Joseph W. Cole et al as the inventors ("Cole") in view of US Patent 5,655,961 issued August 12, 1997 issued August 12, 1997 to John F. Acres et al ("Acres"), in further view of US Published Patent Application 20030153381 filed on January 17, 2003, listing Warren William Slattery as the inventor ("Slattery"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Cole discloses an ergonomically-designed dual station, dual display gaming station with player conveniences. With regard to each independent claim, the Examiner recognizes that Cole fails to teach (at least) the following elements:

- a display coupled to the processor for displaying a bezel and information to the player, the information being displayed within the bezel;
- the processor instructing the display to display instructions for inserting a player ID card into the ID Card reader
- and for displaying cycling media

(see present office action, page 3).

Each of the independent claims 1, 30 and 40 including the following element:

"a display coupled to the processor for displaying a bezel and information to the player, the information being displayed within the bezel"

As shown in Figures 3A-3D, the bezel 50 is "displayed" by the display. For example, in the illustrated embodiment it is an area of the display, located around a periphery of the display, in which a "border" is displayed. Such a "virtual" border is infinitely flexible with respect to the ways or possibilities of providing information to players and other users.

The Examiner utilizes Acres to teach this bezel limitation. However, the Acres' bezel is a hardware implementation of a bezel. See for example, Figure 7A, the bezel is

identified by reference number 116 and paragraph on column 12, lines 49-62 which clearly describe a series of light emitting diodes mounted on a printed circuit board behind the bezel 116.

Clearly, Acres does not disclose the “virtual” bezel, i.e., bezel displayed by the display as required by independent claims 1, 30, and 40.

Slattery discloses a reward selection or win-or-lose result terminal. The Examiner utilizes Slattery to teach the limitation of “displaying cycling media”. However, Slattery does not:

- overcome the deficiencies of Cole or Acres (as described above) or
- teach cycling media in a player tracking device.

Furthermore, Applicants respectfully argue that Slattery cannot be properly combined with Cole and/or Acres, since Slattery specifically states that are not suitable for advertising game machines, such as an electronic poker game or slot machine (see paragraph [0003]).

Since, neither Cole, Acres, or Slattery includes each and every element of independent claims 1, 30, and 40, singularly or in combination, applicants respectfully assert that the §103(a) rejection is improper and must be withdrawn.

Claims 2-10, 13-17, 22-28, and 41 are ultimately dependent upon allowable claim 1 or 40. Therefore, for the reasons set forth above and based on their own merits, applicants respectfully assert that claims 2-10, 13-17, 22-28, and 41 are also allowable.

Claims 11 and 12 were rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Cole, Acres, Slattery, and in further view of US Patent 5,326,104 issued July 5, 1994 to Logan L. Pease (“Pease”). This rejection is respectfully traversed. Claims 11 and 12 are ultimately dependent upon allowable claim 1. Pease does not overcome the deficiencies of Cole, Acres, Slattery. Therefore, for the reasons set forth above, and based on their own merits, applicants respectfully assert that that claims 11 and 12 are also allowable.

Claims 18-21 were rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Cole, Acres, Slattery, and in further view of US Published Patent Application 20030032479, filed August 9, 2001, listing Steven G. LeMay et al as the inventors (“LeMay”). This rejection is respectfully traversed. Claims 11 and 12 are ultimately dependent upon allowable claim 1. LeMay does not overcome the deficiencies of Cole,

Applicant: Jeffrey George
Serial No.: 10/661,128
Group Art Unit: 3712

Acres, Slattery. Therefore, for the reasons set forth above, and based on their own merits, applicants respectfully assert that that claims 18-21 are also allowable.

Claims 29, 31-33 and 37 were rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Cole, Acres, Slattery, and in further view of US Published Patent Application 20020156692, filed April 20, 2001, listing Mark R. Squeglia et al as the inventors ("Squeglia"). This rejection is respectfully traversed. Claims 29, 31-33 and 37 are ultimately dependent upon allowable claims 1 or 30. Squeglia does not overcome the deficiencies of Cole, Acres, Slattery. Therefore, for the reasons set forth above, and based on their own merits, applicants respectfully assert that that claims 29, 31-33 and 37 are also allowable.

Claims 34-36 were rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Cole, Acres, Slattery, and in further view of US Patent 5,611,730 issued March 18, 1997 to Steven A. Weiss. This rejection is respectfully traversed. Claims 34-36 are ultimately dependent upon allowable claim 30. Weiss does not overcome the deficiencies of Cole, Acres, Slattery. Therefore, for the reasons set forth above, and based on their own merits, applicants respectfully assert that that claims 34-36 are also allowable.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the Application, as amended, is now presented in condition for allowance, which allowance is respectfully solicited. Applicant believes that no additional fees are due, however, if any become required, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account 08-2789 in the name of Howard & Howard Attorneys. Further and favorable reconsideration of the outstanding Office Action is hereby requested.

Respectfully submitted

HOWARD & HOWARD ATTORNEYS, P.C.

October 4, 2006
Date

/James R. Yee/
James R. Yee, Registration No. 34,460
The Pinehurst Office Center, Suite #101
39400 Woodward Avenue
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48304
(248) 723-0349